

Appl. No. 10/612,773  
Amdt. Dated February 8, 2005  
Reply to Office action mailed December 16, 2004

Amendment to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 7 and 11. The sheet 7/14 replaces the original sheet 7/14 including Fig. 7. In Fig. 7, the reference number "32" has been corrected to the reference number "34." The sheet 11/14 replaces the original sheet 11/14 including Fig. 11. In Fig. 11, the reference number "29" and its respective lead line have been removed.

Attachment    Two Replacement Sheets  
                  Two Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### **A. Introduction**

In the Office action of December 16, 2004, the Examiner: noted claim 1-10 are withdrawn; objected to drawings, specifically reference characters of FIGS. 8, 11, 13 and 14; objected to the specification at pages 15 and 16; objected to the duplication of claim 13 at claim 15; rejected claims 11, 14, 16, and 17 under 35 USC § 112¶2 noting a limitation of claim 11, two limitations of claim 14, three limitations of claim 16 and a limitation of claim 17 as each having an insufficient antecedent basis for the respective limitation; rejected claim 11 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,749,097 to McElhinny (hereinafter "*McElhinny*"); rejected claim 13 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *McElhinny* in view of US Patent No. 3,028,060 to Haley (hereinafter "*Haley*"); rejected claim 14 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *McElhinny* in view of US Patent No. 2,969,169 to Botnick (hereinafter "*Botnick*"); rejected claim 17 under 35 USC § 103(a) as stating the *McElhinny* and *Botnick* combination would be oriented in a horizontal orientation if the device were rotated 90 degrees and stating the device would still operate in the position. The Examiner objected to claim 12 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### **B. Drawings**

The applicant has amended the specification to address the Examiner's objections to FIGS. 8, 13 and 14. The Applicant has amended FIG. 11 by removing reference character "29" and its corresponding lead line. In addition, the Applicant has amended FIG. 7 by replacing the reference character "32" with "34" which is consistent with the corrected paragraph of page 14, line 29.

### **C. Corrections to the Specification**

As required by the Examiner, the Applicant has corrected the paragraph starting on page 15, line 12, by replacing the reference character "show" with "showing" and the paragraph starting on page 16, line 5, by replacing the reference character "26" with "35" cited in FIG.

14. In addition, the applicant has corrected the paragraph of page 14, line 29, and the paragraph on page 15, line 16, by replacing the reference character "32" with "34."

All other corrections to the specification are grammatical in nature or pertain to punctuation and in either case are not matters of substance. As these corrections require very little consideration by the examiner, the above changes are respectfully requested under 37 CFR §1.312.

#### **D. Objections to Claims**

The Applicant has amended claim 15 to depend from claim 14 and further clarify the second tray of claim 14. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits claim 15 is not an exact duplicate of the original claim 13, and need not be deleted. The Applicant notes the second original claim 16 was misnumbered as claim 16 and is correctly and presently pending as claim 17.

#### **E. Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112¶2**

The Applicant has cancelled claim 11, and amended claims 14, 16 and 17, in order to address each of the rejections for indefiniteness under 35 USC § 112¶2. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully asserts that sufficient antecedent bases are provided for the limitations and clarifications of claims 14, 16 and 17.

#### **F. Claim Rejection under 35 USC § 102(e)**

The Applicant has cancelled claim 11. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the rejection under 35 USC § 102(e) be withdrawn.

#### **G. Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)**


The Applicant has cancelled claim 11 and rewritten claim 12 in independent form including all of the limitation of its base claim 11. Applicant respectfully asserts claim 12, as amended, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, whether taken collectively or separately.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts claim 12 is in condition for allowance. Claims 13-17 have been rewritten to depend from claim 12 with or without intervening claims. As claims 13-17 merely clarify or further limit claim 12, the Applicant respectfully asserts claim 13-17 are also in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) as to claims 12-17 be withdrawn.

#### **H. Conclusion**

The Applicant respectfully submits that the specification and drawings have been amended to fully address the Examiner's rejections and objections. The Applicant respectfully submits that with the cancellation of claim 11 and the amendments to claims 12-17, claims 12-17 are presently in condition for allowance. The Applicant believes no additional fees are anticipated with this response, but should additional fees be required, authorization is hereby given to charge any additional fees, and credit any overcharges pertaining to the prosecution of this matter to Deposit Account No. 02-3979.


Respectfully submitted,




Andrew S. Naglestad  
Registration Number 47,814

Telephone No. (818) 225-2920  
FAX (818) 225-1569

Michael Blaine Brooks, P.C.  
5010 N. Pkwy Calabasas, Suite 104  
Calabasas, CA 91302-3913



**FIG. 7**



**FIG. 11**